

United States Patent and Trademark Office

NITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMES filled States Patest and Trademark Office about COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ED. Box 1402 Alternative Version 22331-1499

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/700,400 11/04/2003		Peter A. Quigley	FPY-048 04	5827	
25181	7590 06/02/2004		EXAMINER		
FOLEY HO		COLE, ELIZABETH M			
PATENT GI	ROUP, WORLD TRADE	CENTER WEST	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
BOSTON, MA 02110			1771		

OATE MAILED: 06/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-		Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/700,400		QUIGLEY ET AL	
		Examiner		Art Unit	
		Elizabeth M. Coli		1771	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover	sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	idress
THE I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MALING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. some of them range be available worder the provisions of 3° CFR 1.1 CSK (6) MATHYS been the making gas on this potential contraction. The properties of the provision of the provision of the properties of the prope	(6(a) In no event, how within the statutory mir of apply and will expire cause the epolication to	wer, may a reply be tim smum of thety (30) days SIX (5) MONTHS from b become ABANDONES	ety filed i will be considered time! the mailing date of this o o rad U.S.C. 6 133).	y. ornrunication,
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on				
2a)	This action is FtNAL. 2b)⊠ Thi	s action is non-fi	nal.		
	Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under a on of Claims				e merits is
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray	n from consider	ation.		
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	Claim(s) 1-61 is/are rejected.				
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)[]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election require	ment.		
Applicati	on Papers				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examiner	:			
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accep	ted or b) object	ed to by the Exar	niner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be hel	d in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11)[The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approve	d b) disappro	ved by the Examin	er.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep	ly to this Office ac	tion.		
12)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer.			
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)	+(d) or (f).	
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been rece	ived.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been rece	ived in Application	on No	
	Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur	ity documents ha eau (PCT Rule 1	ve been receive 7.2(a)).	d in this National	Stage
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of				
	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic				application).
) The translation of the foreign language pro- cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic				
Attachment	(s)				
2) Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No atont Application (PT	

- 1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assigness. See In re Goodman, 1 F-3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993), In re. Longi, 759 F-28 day, 722 USPQ-64 (Fed. Cir. 1985), In re. Van Ornum, 686 F-2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982), In re. Van Ornum, 761 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982), In re. Van Ornum, 761 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982), In re. Van Ornum, 761 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982), In re. Van Ornum, 7
- A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- Claims are 1-61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over at least claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,016,845.
 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other bocause each discloses a composite tubular member.
- Claims 1-61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,148,866 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each discloses a composite tubular member.
- 4. Claims 1-61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-38 of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,558 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each discloses a composite tubular member.
- Claims 1-61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,706,348. Although the

Art Unit: 1771

conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each discloses a composite tubular member.

- 6. Claims 1-61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,361,299. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each discloses a composite tubular member.
- 7. Claims 1-61 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,004,639. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each discloses a composite tubular member.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth M. Cole whose telephone number is (571) 272-1475. The examiner may be reached between 6:30 AM and 6:00 PM Monday through Wednesday, and 6:30 AM and 2 PM on Thursday.

Mr. Terrel Morris, the examiner's supervisor, may be reached at (571) 272-1478.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retireval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information to rupublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.usptp.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (foll-free).

The fax number for all official faxes is (703) 872-9306.

Olicabet M. Cole

Art Unit: 1771

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1771

e.m.c